

## REMARKS

The Examiner maintains the rejection under Section 103 and substitutes the Endo reference in place of the previously cited Lambert reference.


It is respectfully submitted that the Endo reference merely demonstrates that steering wheels having a closed face are known. There is no commonality between the manner of securing the Endo steering wheel to a shaft and the claims at hand. More importantly, the Examiner puts forth no discussion as to how the assembly of Henigue would be modified to include the Endo steering wheel, and only makes the naked statement that to do so would "reduce the number of parts." A reduction in parts is not in and of itself necessarily an improvement in a given structure. There is absolutely no teaching, suggestion or motivation to combine these two references. The Endo wheel has a distinct mounting assembly that does not relate to the coupling assembly shown in Henigue. Simply stating that the references can be combined is insufficient as a basis for rejecting the claims. The prior art makes no suggestion as to the desirability of the claimed invention. (see MPEP 2143.01). The Henigue reference shows no concern as to mounting a steering wheel to address the problems and benefits described in the application at hand.

With all due respect, the Examiner's continued assertion that threading in Henigue constitutes "hub anti-rotational means for precluding relative independent rotational movement between said hub and said coupling member" is absurd from an engineering perspective. The purpose of threading is to allow for rotational movement - a nut is rotated on threading to join it to a bolt, a screw is rotated on its threading to insert it into a piece of wood, the hub of Henigue is rotated on threading to join it to the coupling member. That is why nuts often have to be retightened on bolts, they loosen because of relative rotation. The threading in Henigue is to

allow for relative independent rotational movement between the hub and the coupling member so that they become joined - it does nothing to prevent relative rotation of the two components. Applicant requests that the Examiner please explain how the threading in Henigue prevents relative rotation of the hub and coupling member.

Applicant respectfully submits that all the claims as presented are patentable, on the basis of the above remarks, and reconsideration and subsequent passage for allowance is hereby requested. In the event that the Examiner maintains the rejections, Applicant requests for purposes of appeal that all of the Henigue components cited by the Examiner be particularly identified by number from the drawing, such as for example, the "hub".

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Thomas C. Saitta", with a stylized flourish at the end.

Thomas C. Saitta, Reg. No. 32102  
Attorney for Applicant

Rogers Towers, P.A.  
1301 Riverplace Blvd.  
Suite 1500  
Jacksonville, FL 32207  
904-346-5518  
904-396-0663 (fax)